From: Lisa Ganz
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:30 AM
To: Chris Hart; Mike Scott; Sharon Gillespie; Sharon Barton; Lance Anderson; ksmith@ivinsutah.com; Bryan Pack; Kari Jimenez
Subject: Fw: 2025-08-21 Ivins City Council Work Meeting Agenda; 2025-08-21 Ivins City Council Meeting Agenda
Attachments: 2025-08-21 Ivins City Council Work Meeting Agenda.pdf; 2025-08-21 Ivins City Council Meeting Agenda.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you can verify the sender.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORDS:

Good afternoon Mayor and Council-

These comments are in reference to item 4A/B on the 8/21/25 city council agenda relating to the concurrent land use and zone amendment request for the parcel near 290 So. and 100 W.

I listened to the Planning Commission meeting where this item was approved by a 3/2 vote. I found the facts and findings in support of the motion to be somewhat baseless, maybe even exaggerated(?) and with all due respect, expect a bit more from the city on tough issues. I get it. The state mandates on moderate income housing are real, but they don't apply to all land use and zone amendment requests. They shouldn't be used as a justification to rubber stamp approval and must not be used in place of thoughtful city planning. I hope you all take the time to watch the playback and take these points into consideration.

Pam kicked off the discussion by seemingly warning/threatening that the denial of the land use amendment would be a "taking" by the city which would violate the applicant's private property rights, thus illegal. (Cop out #1). The applicant is requesting a higher density variance/amendment to an existing land use designation that's governed by the city code. I'm no lawyer, but isn't that the city's job?! Land use and the table of uses are pretty much the only tools the city has in the toolbox to manage development. We've become so used to the city rolling over on every upzone request that we've forgotten that denial is an option for the city.

Approving a **land use** change is a BIG DEAL! Land use discussions should only be done in totality with the general plan and the vision of the city and NOT as one-off requests by a landowner or developer. As we know, once the land use is changed, there's no going back. It stays with the property. We have no guarantees that what today's applicant says will be built. The city isn't obligated to approve this request, but the PC sure seemed to swiftly throw up their hands and rubber stamp approval (Cop out #2) as if they were avoiding a property owner rights vs city lawsuit.

There was a lot of handwringing on the affordable housing "crisis", the state mandates, the "responsibilities for future generations" and water. Lots of things that just seem to be out of their control .... so, throw up the hands again. (Cop out #3). While the state does have requirements, the city **is** complying with a moderate-income housing plan and a land use plan that address goals, strategies and locations within the city for various demographics and densities.

This parcel and most of the neighboring parcels are designated as MDR. (Side bar....Did Dave really argue that Unity Villages' MDR land use designation isn't really MDR? And his so called "triggered" rant was dramatic but didn't justify putting HDR in an area designated for MDR.)

As Perry mentioned, the city thoughtfully planned out other areas in the city where HDR would be appropriate. The city DOES have areas where different demographics and densities are considered. It's time to stop apologizing and chasing solutions-for-the-day. It's very clearly stated in the MIH plan that the land use ..."*directs developers to areas in the City that they could look to when they are interested in high-density use. The land use plan gives guidance to where a high-density zone should be requested.*"

Per the GP, the land use plan "*should be used to ensure that new development and redevelopment are consistent with the Land Use Plan. Additionally, the Plan should help developers understand what types of development are appropriate for different properties. By referencing the Plan in development discussions, the City can help ensure that a consistent and community-supported pattern of growth is achieved.*"

As the council has mentioned many times before, the city doesn't do the building, and it can only be responsible for providing areas where higher densities could be developed. This parcel isn't in an area designated for higher density and the city isn't required to add new HDR areas in an effort to comply with state mandates. No excuses needed if the MIH plan is followed. It also needs to be reiterated that just changing a density designation does not necessarily make it affordable.

The applicant has stated that they want to build smaller single-family lots in an HDR area. What would stop them from doing that up to 4.64 units/acre in an MDR area?

Do the right thing here. I respectfully urge you to deny this concurrent land use and zone amendment request. And, I hope that the Table of Uses and Land Use discussions get on the city agenda asap.

Thanks in advance.
Lisa